

May 27, 2004

**NOTICE OF INDEPENDENT REVIEW DECISION
Corrected Letter**

MDR Tracking #: M2-04-1265-01

___ has been certified by the Texas Department of Insurance (TDI) as an independent review organization (IRO). The ___ IRO Certificate Number is 5348. Texas Worker's Compensation Commission (TWCC) Rule §133.308 allows for a claimant or provider to request an independent review of a Carrier's adverse medical necessity determination. TWCC assigned the above-reference case to ___ for independent review in accordance with this Rule.

___ has performed an independent review of the proposed care to determine whether or not the adverse determination was appropriate. Relevant medical records, documentation provided by the parties referenced above and other documentation and written information submitted regarding this appeal was reviewed during the performance of this independent review.

This case was reviewed by a practicing physician on the ___ external review panel. The reviewer has met the requirements for the ADL of TWCC or has been approved as an exception to the ADL requirement. This physician is board certified in neurosurgery and is familiar with the condition and treatment options at issue in this appeal. The ___ physician reviewer signed a statement certifying that no known conflicts of interest exist between this physician and any of the treating physicians or providers or any of the physicians or providers who reviewed this case for a determination prior to the referral to ___ for independent review. In addition, the ___ physician reviewer certified that the review was performed without bias for or against any party in this case.

Clinical History

This case concerns a 37 year-old male who sustained a work related injury on ___. The patient reported that while at work he was driving a tractor at the airport when he was hit from the side by a car, injuring his low back, left wrist and knee. On 10/16/03 the patient reportedly underwent x-rays of the lumbar spine that were reported to be negative. The patient underwent an MRI of the lumbar spine on 11/21/03 that was reported to have shown central focal protrusion/herniation at L4-5, disc bulge at L5-S1 with compression of the left L5 nerve root, and suspect acute vs. chronic radial tears at these two levels. An x-ray of the left knee performed on 2/5/04 was reported to have been negative. The diagnoses for this patient have included spasm of muscle and lumbago. Treatment for this patient's condition has included medications, physical therapy and a home exercise program. The purchase of an RS4i sequential stimulator has been recommended for further treatment of this patient's condition.

Requested Services

Purchase of an RS4i sequential stimulator (4 channel combination interferential 7 muscle stimulator unit)

Documents and/or information used by the reviewer to reach a decision:

Documents Submitted by Requestor:

1. Office note 12/8/03
2. RS Medical Prescription 12/16/03, 2/24/04

Documents Submitted by Respondent:

1. Review of Medical History & Physical Exam 3/29/04

Decision

The Carrier's denial of authorization for the requested services is upheld.

Rationale/Basis for Decision

The ___ physician reviewer noted that this case concerns a 37 year-old male who sustained a work related injury to his back on ____. The ___ physician reviewer also noted that the diagnoses for this patient have included spasm of muscle and lumbago. The ___ physician reviewer further noted that the treatment for this patient's condition has included medications, physical therapy, a home exercise program and an RS4i sequential stimulator. The ___ physician reviewer indicated that the purchase of an RS4i sequential stimulator has been recommended for further treatment of this patient's condition. The MAIMUS physician reviewer explained that there is no objective evidence that confirms the efficacy of the interferential muscle stimulator. Therefore, the ___ physician consultant concluded that the requested purchase of an RS4i sequential stimulator (4 channel combination interferential & muscle stimulator unit) is not medically necessary to treat this patient's condition at this time.

This decision is deemed to be a TWCC Decision and Order.

YOUR RIGHT TO REQUEST A HEARING

Either party to this medical dispute may disagree with all or part of the decision and has a right to request a hearing.

If disputing a spinal surgery prospective decision a request for a hearing must be in writing and it must be received by the TWCC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within **10 (ten)** days of your receipt of this decision. (20 Tex. Admin. Code 142.5(c)).

If disputing other prospective medical necessity (preauthorization) decisions a request for a hearing must be in writing and it must be received by the TWCC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within **20 (twenty)** days of your receipt of this decision. (28 Tex. Admin. Code 148.3)

This decision is deemed received by you 5 (five) days after it was mailed. (28 Tex. Admin. Code 102.4(h) or 102.5(d)). A request for a hearing should be sent to:

Chief Clerk of Proceedings/Appeals Clerk
P.O. Box 17787
Austin, TX 78744
Fax: 512-804-4011

A copy of this decision should be attached to the request.

The party appealing the decision shall deliver a copy of its written request for a hearing to all other parties involved in the dispute. (Commission Rule 133.308(t)(2))

Sincerely,

I hereby verify that a copy of this Independent Review Organization (IRO) Decision was sent to the carrier, the requestor and claimant via facsimile or U.S. Postal Service from the office of the IRO on this 25th day of May 2004.